

1 PHILLIP A. TALBERT
2 United States Attorney
3 DAVID L. GAPPY
4 Assistant United States Attorney
5 2500 Tulare Street
Suite 4401
Fresno, California 93721
Telephone: (559) 497-4000
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
7 United States of America

8
9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
11 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

13 Plaintiff,

v.

14 JACOB JACOBSEN,

15 Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:22-CR-00304-ADA-BAM

STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;
FINDINGS AND ORDER

PROPOSED DATE: September 27, 2023
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

16
17 This case is scheduled for a status conference on July 26, 2023, but the parties have agreed to
move this hearing to September 27, 2023.

18
19 Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the
basis of [her] findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of
20 the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is
21 excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or
22 finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of
23 the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

24
25 Recently, the Ninth Circuit enumerated a “non-exhaustive” list of seven factors it found to be
“relevant” in considering ends-of-justice Speedy Trial Act continuances “in the context of the COVID-
19 pandemic.” *United States v. Olsen*, 21 F.4th 1036, 1047 (9th Cir. 2022). That non-exhaustive list
26 includes: (1) whether a defendant is detained pending trial; (2) how long a defendant has been detained;

1 (3) whether a defendant has invoked speedy trial rights since the case's inception; (4) whether a
2 defendant, if detained, belongs to a population that is particularly susceptible to complications if infected
3 with the virus; (5) the seriousness of the charges a defendant faces, and in particular whether the
4 defendant is accused of violent crimes; (6) whether there is a reason to suspect recidivism if the charges
5 against the defendant are dismissed; and (7) whether the district court has the ability to safely conduct a
6 trial. *Id.*

7 In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this court should consider the following
8 case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-
9 justice exception, § 3161(h)(7). When continued, this court should designate a new date for the hearing.
10 *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be
11 "specifically limited in time").

12 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and
13 through defendant's counsel of record, accordingly stipulate as follows:

14 1. By previous order this matter was set for a status conference hearing on July 26, 2023.
15 The Court more recently has invited a continuance of this hearing if counsel do not believe that anything
16 substantial can be accomplished at the currently scheduled hearing.

17 2. By this stipulation, the parties agree that the next status conference be scheduled for
18 September 27, 2023, and to exclude time between July 26, 2023, and September 27, 2023, under 18
19 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv).

20 3. The parties agree, and request that the Court find the following:

21 a) Defense counsel, with the assistance of an investigator, has completed the review
22 of all available evidence. An additional continuance is required to permit appointed counsel to
23 finish discussing with the defendant how best to resolve his case. Defense counsel has requested
24 a proposed resolution from the government.

25 b) The government does not object to the continuance and joins in the request.

26 c) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the
27 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the
28 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

1 d) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,
2 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period from July 26, 2023, to September 27,
3 2023, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i),
4 (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the request of the
5 parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action
6 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

7 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the
8 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial
9 must commence.

10 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

11 Dated: July 18, 2023

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
United States Attorney

14 _____
15 /s/ David Gappa
16 DAVID L. GAPPY
17 Assistant United States Attorney

18 Dated: July 19, 2023

19 _____
20 /s/ DOUGLAS FOSTER
21 DOUGLAS FOSTER
22 COUNSEL FOR
23 JACOB JACOBSEN

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JACOB JACOBSEN,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:22-CR-00304-ADA-BAM

FINDINGS AND ORDER

PROPOSED DATE: September 27, 2023

TIME: 1:00 p.m.

COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

The court has reviewed and considered the stipulation filed by the parties on July 19, 2023, and also reviewed the record of this case. IT IS SO ORDERED that the status conference is continued from July 26, 2023, to **September 27, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe**. For the reasons stated in the stipulation the period of time from July 26, 2023, through September 27, 2023, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the request of the parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 19, 2023

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE